

REMARKS

This response is submitted in response to an Office Action transmitted on July 5, 2007. Claims 1-31 were pending at the time the Office Action was issued. Applicants hereby amend claims 1-23 and 26-31. Claims 1-31 remain pending.

In the interest of reducing the issues to be considered in this response, the following remarks focus principally on the patentability of independent claims 1 and 15. The patentability of each of the dependent claims is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However, Applicants' decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and each dependent claim should not be considered as an admission that Applicants concur with the conclusions set forth in the Office Action that these dependent claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the cited references. Similarly, Applicants' decision not to discuss differences between the prior art and every claim element, or every comment set forth in the Office Action, should not be considered as an admission that Applicants concur with the interpretation and assertions presented in the Office Action regarding those claims. Indeed, Applicants believe that all of the dependent claims patentably distinguish over the references cited. Moreover, a specific traverse of the rejection of each dependent claim is not required, since dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend.

I. OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The disclosure is objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended the specification to refer to the co-pending application by the application serial number rather than the attorney docket number. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

II. OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a). Applicants have amended each of the relevant claims to recite a “destination object” instead of a “component.” Further, Applicants respectfully submit that “destination object” is shown by the “destination 116” and/or the “custom destination 316” of Figures 1 and 3, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 10-11, 13, 15-21, 25-26, and 28-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as having been anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,279,029 to Sampat *et al.* (hereinafter “Sampat”). Respectfully, Applicants traverse the rejections, and submit that the claims are allowable over the reference cited to Sampat for at least the reasons explained in detail below.

Claims 1-6, 10-11, 13 and 28-31

Claims 2-6, 10-11, 13, and 28-31 depend from claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A system comprising:
one or more computer-readable media, the one or more computer-readable media including:
 - a presentation that includes media content, the media content comprising at least one of audio content and video content;
 - a media engine to obtain input information from the media content, the input information including a descriptor and media type information;
 - a destination object to receive the input information from the media engine, the destination object further selectively associates the input information with one or more output presentation descriptors, and to provide the one or more output presentation descriptors to the media engine; and
 - an application to provide the presentation to an output target, the application further configured to create the media engine and the destination object,wherein the media engine is further configured to obtain at least one transform and setup at least one media sink based on the one or more output presentation descriptors to process the presentation for output to the output target.

First, Sampat does not teach or suggest, “a *destination object* to receive the input information from the media engine, the destination object further *associates* the *input information* with *one or more output presentation descriptors*, and to provide the one or more output presentation descriptors *to the media engine*,” as recited in claim 1. (emphasis added).

Instead, Sampat discloses a server software architecture 1512 that receives audio, video, and text data streams, and transforms the network data packets for transmission over a network. (Column 7, Lines 66-67; Column 8, Lines 1-4). However, Sampat does not teach or suggest that the server software architecture

1512 is capable of providing data related to the audio, video, and text data streams, such as the “output presentation descriptors” recited in claim 1, to another component of the server 102.

Second, Sampat does not teach or suggest, “an application to provide the presentation to an output target, *the application further configured to create the media engine and the destination object*,” as recited in claim 1. (emphasis added). Specifically, Sampat does not disclose that a software component residing on its server 102, such as the server software architecture 1512, is capable of creating a software object. (Column 7, Lines 47-67; Column 8, Lines 1-32).

Third, Sampat does not teach or suggest, “wherein the media engine is further configured to obtain at least one transform and setup at least one media sink *based on the one or more output presentation descriptors* to process the presentation for output to the output target,” as recited in claim 1. (emphasis added).

Instead, Sampat discloses a server software architecture that includes media service provider sinks. (Column 9, Lines 29-40; Column 13, Line 62-67; Column 14, Lines 1-55). However, Sampat does not teach or suggest that its media service provider sinks are capable of being set up “based on the one or more output presentation descriptors,” as recited in claim 1. Additionally, Sampat also does not teach or disclose setting up “at least one transform based on the one or more output presentation descriptors,” as further recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, Sampat fails to anticipate claim 1. Moreover, since claims 2-6, 10-11, and 13 depend from claim 1, they are at least allowable due to their dependency, as well as due to additional limitations recited.

Specifically, since Sampat does not disclose that a software component residing on its server 102, such as the server software architecture 1512, is capable of creating a software object, Sampat cannot teach or suggest claims 2-6, 10-11, 13 and 28-31, as each of the claim recites a “destination object” that is created by an application that resides in the one or more computer-readable media of a system. Accordingly, claims 2-6, 10-11, 13 and 28-31 are further allowable over Sampat.

Claims 15-21 and 25-26

Claims 16-21 and 25-26 depend from claim 15. Claim 15 recites:

15. A method for use by an application in presenting a presentation, the method comprising:
 - selectively providing input information describing media content to be presented in the presentation to a destination object in response to an operation by a media engine;
 - selectively associating the input information with output information using the destination object, the output information enabling the transformation of the presentation for output to an output target; and
 - providing output information from the destination object to the media engine,wherein the media engine provides the presentation to the output target without requiring further interaction with the application by selectively obtaining at least one transform and setting up at least one media sink based on the output information.

First, Sampat does not teach or suggest, “*selectively associating the input information with output information* using the destination object, the output information enabling the transformation of the presentation for output to an output target,” as recited in claim 15. (emphasis added).

Instead, Sampat discloses providing a Program Guide window 300 that displays a list of “channels currently being transmitted the computer network and a list 304 of the channels to be transmitted over the computer network in the future”. (Column 5, Lines 38-43). The Program Guide window 300 is displayed to the user when the user selects the Guide option in the channel controls 204 of the user interface 200. (Column 5, Lines 35-38).

However, Sampat does not teach a “destination object” that is capable of associating “input information” that “describes media content to be presented in the presentation” to “output information,” wherein the “output information” enables the “transformation of the presentation for output to an output target.”

Second, Sampat does not teach or suggest, “wherein the media engine provides the presentation to the output target without requiring further interaction with the application by *selectively* obtaining at least one transform and setting up at least one media sink *based on the output information*,” as recited in claim 15. (emphasis added).

Instead, Sampat discloses a server software architecture that includes media service provider sinks. (Column 9, Lines 29-40, Column 13, Line 62-Column 14, Lines 55). However, Sampat does not teach or suggest that its media service provider sinks are capable of being selectively set up “based on the output information,” as recited in claim 15. Additionally, Sampat also does not teach or disclose setting up “at least one transform based on the output information,” as further recited in claim 15.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, Sampat fails to anticipate claim 15. Moreover, since claims 16-21, 25-26, and 28-31 depend from claim 15,

they are at least allowable due to their dependency, as well as due to additional limitations recited.

Specifically, claim 19 is further allowable over Sampat. Claim 19, as amended, recites:

19. The method of claim 15, wherein selectively associating the input information with output information includes associating an input media stream with a presentation output media stream to be presented in the presentation.

Sampat does not teach or suggest “associating an *input* media stream with a presentation *output* media stream to be presented in the presentation.” (emphasis added). Instead, Sampat disclose a server application 1602 that relates “data streams” together as channels. (Column 8, Lines 46-60). However, Sampat does not teach or suggest that its “data streams” include “input” data streams and “output” data streams, or that the “input” data streams may be associated with the “output” data streams. Accordingly, claim 19 is further allowable over Sampat.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7-9 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sampat in view of the U.S. Patent 6,321,252 to Bhola *et al.* (hereinafter “Bhola”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 7-9

Claims 7-9 depend from Claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A system comprising:
one or more computer-readable media, the one or more computer-readable media including:

- a presentation that includes media content, the media content comprising at least one of audio content and video content;
 - a media engine to obtain input information from the media content, the input information including a descriptor and media type information;
 - a destination object to receive the input information from the media engine, the destination object further selectively associates the input information with one or more output presentation descriptors, and to provide the one or more output presentation descriptors to the media engine; and
 - an application to provide the presentation to an output target, the application further configured to create the media engine and the destination object,
- wherein the media engine is further configured to obtain at least one transform and setup at least one media sink based on the one or more output presentation descriptors to process the presentation for output to the output target.

Applicants respectfully incorporate the argument present above in response to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by analogy. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Sampat does not teach or disclose the system as recited in claim 1. (emphasis added).

Moreover, the deficiencies of Sampat are not remedied by Bhola. Instead, Bhola discloses the creation of an event stream and the replication of an event stream, and a clock object that includes a source-clock object 250 and a sink-clock object 260. (Column 3, Lines 35-67; Column 6, Lines 6-57; Column 7, Lines 14-35). However, Bhola does not teach or suggest, as recited in claim 1:

a destination object to receive the input information from the media engine, the destination object further associates the input information with one or more output presentation descriptors, and to provide the one or more output presentation descriptors to the media engine;

an application to provide the presentation to an output target, the application further configured to create the media engine and the destination object, wherein the media engine is further configured to obtain at least one transform and setup at least one media sink *based on the one or more output presentation descriptors* to process the presentation for output to the output target. (emphasis added).

Accordingly, the cited references to Sampat and Bhola, whether individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the system recited in claim 1. Further, since claims 7-9 depend from claim 1, they are also allowable over the cited references at least due to their dependency, as well as due to additional limitations recited.

Claims 22-24

Claims 22-24 depend from Claim 15. Claim 15, as amended, recites:

15. A method for use by an application in presenting a presentation, the method comprising:
 - selectively providing input information describing media content to be presented in the presentation to a destination object in response to an operation by a media engine;
 - selectively associating the input information with output information using the destination object, the output information enabling the transformation of the presentation for output to an output target; and
 - providing output information from the destination object to the media engine,wherein the media engine provides the presentation to the output target without requiring further interaction with the application by selectively obtaining at least one transform and setting up at least one media sink based on the output information.

Applicants respectfully incorporate the argument present above in response to the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by analogy. Accordingly,

Applicants submit that Sampat does not teach or disclose the method recited in claim 15.

Moreover, the deficiencies of Sampat are not remedied by Bhola. Instead, Bhola discloses the creation of an event stream and the replication of an event stream, and a clock object that includes a source-clock object 250 and a sink-clock object 260. (Column 3, Lines 35-67; Column 6, Lines 6-57; Column 7, Lines 14-35). However, Bhola does not teach or suggest, as recited in claim 15:

selectively associating the input information with output information using the destination object, the output information enabling the transformation of the presentation for output to an output target; wherein the media engine provides the presentation to the output target without requiring further interaction with the application by selectively obtaining at least one transform and setting up at least one media sink based on the output information.

Accordingly, the cited references to Sampat and Bhola, whether individually or in combination, do not disclose, teach or fairly suggest the method recited in claim 15. Further, since claims 22-24 depend from claim 15, they are also allowable over the cited references at least due to their dependency, as well as due to additional limitations recited.

Claim 12

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sampat in view of U.S. Patent 6,694,368 to An *et al.* (hereinafter “An”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A system comprising:

one or more computer-readable media, the one or more computer-readable media including:

- a presentation that includes media content, the media content comprising at least one of audio content and video content;
 - a media engine to obtain input information from the media content, the input information including a descriptor and media type information;
 - a destination object to receive the input information from the media engine, the destination object further selectively associates the input information with one or more output presentation descriptors, and to provide the one or more output presentation descriptors to the media engine; and
 - an application to provide the presentation to an output target, the application further configured to create the media engine and the destination object,
- wherein the media engine is further configured to obtain at least one transform and setup at least one media sink based on the one or more output presentation descriptors to process the presentation for output to the output target.

Applicants respectfully incorporate the argument present above in response to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by analogy. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Sampat does not teach or disclose the method recited in claim 1.

Moreover, the deficiencies of Sampat are not remedied by An. Instead, An discloses a stream interface 13 that includes three sub-properties, these sub-properties includes a stream bus 17, a stream Quality of Service (QoS) semantic 18, and a stream direction 19. (Column 8, Lines 15-19). Further, the stream bus property 17 describes a stream bus interface standard that includes a media type, a media format, etc. (Column 8, Lines 20-25). However, An does not teach or suggest, as recited in claim 1:

a *destination object* to receive the input information from the media engine, the destination object further *associates* the *input information* with *one or more output presentation descriptors*, and to provide the one or more output presentation descriptors *to the media engine*;

an application to provide the presentation to an output target, the application further configured to create the media engine and the destination object,

wherein the media engine is further configured to obtain at least one transform and setup at least one media sink *based on the one or more output presentation descriptors* to process the presentation for output to the output target. (emphasis added).

Accordingly, the cited references to Sampat and An, whether individually or in combination, do not disclose, teach or fairly suggest the method recited in claim 1. Further, since claim 12 depends from claim 1, it is also allowable over the cited references at least due to its dependency, as well as due to additional limitations recited.

Claim 27

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sampat in view of An. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 27 depends from claim 15. Claim 15, as amended, recites:

15. A method for use by an application in presenting a presentation, the method comprising:
 - selectively providing input information describing media content to be presented in the presentation to a destination object in response to an operation by a media engine;
 - selectively associating the input information with output information using the destination object, the output information enabling the transformation of the presentation for output to an output target; and
 - providing output information from the destination object to the media engine,wherein the media engine provides the presentation to the output target without requiring further interaction with the application by selectively obtaining at least one

transform and setting up at least one media sink based on the output information.

Applicants respectfully incorporate the argument present above in response to the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by analogy. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Sampat does not teach or disclose the method recited in claim 15.

Moreover, the deficiencies of Sampat are not remedied by An. Instead, An discloses a stream interface 13 that includes three sub-properties, the sub-properties include a stream bus 17, a stream Quality of Service (QoS) semantic 18, and a stream direction 19. (Column 8, Lines 15-19). Further, the stream bus property 17 describes a stream bus interface standard that includes a media type, a media format, etc. (Column 8, Lines 20-25). However, An does not teach or suggest, as recited in claim 15:

selectively associating the input information with output information using the destination object, the output information enabling the transformation of the presentation for output to an output target;
wherein the media engine provides the presentation to the output target without requiring further interaction with the application by *selectively* obtaining at least one transform and setting up at least one media sink *based on the output information*.

Accordingly, the cited references to Sampat and An, whether individually or in combination, do not disclose, teach or fairly suggest the method recited in claim 15. Further, since claim 27 depends from claim 1, it is also allowable over the cited references at least due to its dependency, as well as due to additional limitations recited.

Claim 14

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sampat in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0073912 to Meza *et al.* (hereinafter “Meza”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 14 depends from claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A system comprising:
one or more computer-readable media, the one or more computer-readable media including:
 - a presentation that includes media content, the media content comprising at least one of audio content and video content;
 - a media engine to obtain input information from the media content, the input information including a descriptor and media type information;
 - a destination object to receive the input information from the media engine, the destination object further selectively associates the input information with one or more output presentation descriptors, and to provide the one or more output presentation descriptors to the media engine; and
 - an application to provide the presentation to an output target, the application further configured to create the media engine and the destination object,wherein the media engine is further configured to obtain at least one transform and setup at least one media sink based on the one or more output presentation descriptors to process the presentation for output to the output target.

Applicants respectfully incorporate the argument present above in response to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by analogy. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Sampat does not teach or disclose the method recited in claim 1.

Moreover, the deficiencies of Sampat are not remedied by Meza. Instead, Meza discloses a software server 322(b) that delivers presentation data in a

predetermined order. (Paragraph 122, Lines 4-7). However, Meza does not teach or suggest, as recited in claim 1:

a *destination object* to receive the input information from the media engine, the destination object further *associates the input information with one or more output presentation descriptors*, and to provide the one or more output presentation descriptors *to the media engine*;

an application to provide the presentation to an output target, the application further configured to create the media engine and the destination object,

wherein the media engine is further configured to obtain at least one transform and setup at least one media sink *based on the one or more output presentation descriptors* to process the presentation for output to the output target. (emphasis added).

Accordingly, the cited references to Sampat and Meza, whether individually or in combination, do not disclose, teach or fairly suggest the method recited in claim 1. Further, since claim 14 depends from claim 1, it is also allowable over the cited references at least due to its dependency, as well as due to additional limitations recited.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-31 are now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining matters that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 10-12-07

By: 

Elliott Y. Chen
Reg. No. 58,293
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Ave, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: (206) 315-4001 x104
or (206) 315-7914
Fax: (206) 315-4004